

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. ITW-13111 . 10/19/2001 John H. Schneider 5951 10/042,985 EXAMINER 7590 12/22/2004 DENNIS M. FLSHERTY, ESQ. TRUONG, THANH K OSTRAGER CHONG FAHERTY & BROITMAN P. C. ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 250 PARK ANENUE **SUITE 825** 3721 NEW YORK, NY 10177-0899

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			0
Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)	1
	10/042,985	SCHNEIDER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	<del></del> -
	Thanh K Truong	3721	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence address	s
THE REPLY FILED 29 October 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica ) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to h places the application	a n in
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f).	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF Th	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See	MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The see have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period see under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 (c)	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ice later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The appropriation of the fee. The appropriation of the final Office of the final Office of the final Office of the feet appropriate o	ate extension ce action; or
<ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF</li> </ol>			
<ol><li>The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b</li></ol>	ecause:		
(a)  they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		i
(c)  they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simpli	fying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.	
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	l be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed ame	endment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		dered but does NOT pl	ace the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were ne	wly
<ol> <li>For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w</li> </ol>			an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ app	roved or b) disapproved by the	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	_:////	
0. Other:		fully 1	
	Supe	Rinaldi I. Rada rvisory Patent Examine Group 3700	r

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The examiner maintains that the new ground of the rejection in the Final Office Action is proper, and the Applicant's After Final Argument is noticed but not entered.

In response to the Applicant's argument that the examiner final rejection without any citation to prior art and without any basis in logic, the examiner disagrees. Again, form the Applicant's disclosure (page 8, lines 19-31 and page 9, lines 1-2):

"As seen in FIG. 1, the slits 20 are inclined ... Alternatively, lines of weakness may be employed in place of slits, provided that such lines of weakness yield easily when the consumer tries to tear the header open, ... Again, such a line of weakness may comprise a line of spaced slits, a line of spaced perforations, a continuous or discontinuous score-line of thinned header material, a continuous or discontinuous line of pre-weakened header material, or any equivalent structure for providing a line of preferential tearing."

Base on this disclosure, the examiner has concluded that the Strand's (6,360,513) line of weakness 13 is an alternative of the Applicant's slit 20, and thus the 103 rejection instead of the 102 rejection in the previous Office Action (mailed April 9, 2004).

Applicant's arguments filed July 12, 2004 and October 29, 2004 are the same arguments, and the examiner has clearly indicated in the Final Office Action the rationale for the 103 rejection of claims 1, 3-11, 13-22, 49 52 and 54-55 which is a new ground of rejection.